

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, and 8 are currently amended. Claims 13-26 have been canceled. New claims 27-35 have been added. Applicants submit that support for the claim amendments and the newly added claims can be found throughout the specification and the drawings. Applicants further reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of any and all cancelled claims in other Applications.

Claims 1-12 and 27-35 are now pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-15, 17, 18, and 21-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by non-patent literature entitled “Stability Lab Information Manager” (hereinafter “SLIM”). Claims 3 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over SLIM in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,523 to Strong (hereinafter “Strong”). Claims 6, 7, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over SLIM in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133395 to Hughes et al. (hereinafter “Hughes”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 102(b)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-15, 17, 18, and 21-26 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on SLIM.

Applicants respectfully note that to anticipate a pending claim, a prior art reference must provide, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the pending claim. (M.P.E.P. § 2131).

The Office Action alleges that SLIM teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-15, 17, 18, and 21-26. However, based on the arguments presented below, Applicants respectfully submit that SLIM fails to teach or suggest one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-15, 17, 18, and 21-26.

For example, amended claim 1 recites the following features:

providing one or more first interfaces that enable a user to specify requirements that need to be fulfilled for stability studies;

receiving input via the one or more first interfaces indicative of a set of requirements for the stability study;

providing one or more second interfaces that enable a user to specify actions to be performed for stability studies;

receiving input via the one or more first interfaces indicative of a set of actions to be performed for the stability study;

providing one or more third interfaces that enable a user to specify a set of business rules for stability studies; and

receiving input via the one or more third interfaces indicative of a set of business rules for the stability study.

SLIM, however, fails to teach or suggest that one or more interfaces are provided that enable a user to specify requirements that need to be fulfilled, actions to be performed, and business rules for stability studies as recited in claim 1.

Applicants further respectfully submit that SLIM fails to teach or suggest each limitation recited in new claim 34. Claim 34 recites the system of claim 33 wherein the first interface is further configured to enable the user to create a specification for a first stability study as an overlay using a specification for a second stability study as a base.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 27, and 34 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 1-12, 28-32, and 35 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 27, and 34 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons, some of which are discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants further respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 3 and 16 as being unpatentable over SLIM in view of Strong, and the

Appl. No. 10/666,403
Amdt. dated January 7, 2008
Reply to Office Action of September 5, 2007

PATENT

rejections to claims 6, 7, 19, and 20 as being unpatentable over SLIM in view of Hughes as neither cures the deficiencies of SLIM.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
61158150 v1